



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/748,617 | 12/22/2000 | Daniel P. Starkovich | RA 5342 (33012/303/101) | 4591 |
| 27516 | 7590 | 10/21/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| UNISYS CORPORATION | | | NEURAUTER, GEORGE C | |
| MS 4773 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| PO BOX 64942 | | | 2143 | |
| ST. PAUL, MN 55164-0942 | | | DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/748,617 | STARKOVICH ET AL. |
| | Examiner George C. Neurauter, Jr. | Art Unit 2143 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2000.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are currently presented and have been examined.

Claim Objections

Claims 9-11 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 9 and 10 are dependent on themselves. In order to expedite prosecution, the Examiner will assume that claim 9 depends from claim 8 and claim 10 depends from claim 9.

Claim 11 recites:

"a. composing a service request in a first formats..."

"Formats" should be "format."

Claim 11 further recites:

"b. transferring said service request via a publically accessible digital data communication network to one of a gateway a server..." The Examiner cannot reasonably assume what is meant by this statement. The Applicant is required to amend the statement.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 2143

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5 754 772 A to Leaf.

Regarding claim 1, Leaf discloses in a data processing system having a user terminal for entering a transaction request responsively coupled via a publically available digital communication network to an enterprise server for responding to said transaction request, the improvement comprising:

a. A first gateway ("CGI program") interposed between said user terminal ("Web browser") and said enterprise server ("database engine") which converts said service request to a format suitable for response by said enterprise server without the use of a view buffer. (column 1, lines 25-27 and 57-67)

Regarding claim 2, Leaf discloses the improvement according to claim 1, further comprising a second gateway ("instance of transaction gateway client") interposed between said user terminal and said enterprise server wherein said second gateway converts said service request to a format suitable for response by said enterprise server through the use of a view buffer. (column 2, lines 48-60; column 7, lines 7-35)

Regarding claim 3, Leaf discloses the improvement according to claim 2, wherein said publically available digital

Art Unit: 2143

communication network further comprises the Internet. (column 4, lines 10-16)

Regarding claim 4, Leaf discloses the improvement according to claim 3 further comprising an NT server housing said first gateway and providing a WebTx environment. (column 5, lines 37-45; column 6, lines 27-48)

Regarding claim 5, Leaf discloses the improvement according to claim 3 wherein said user terminal further comprises an industry compatible personal computer. (column 4, lines 18-24)

Regarding claim 6, Leaf discloses an apparatus comprising:

- a. A user terminal which generates a service request in a first format; ("web browser")
- b. A publically accessible digital data communication network responsively coupled to said user terminal; ("Internet")
- c. An enterprise server which honors said service request in a second format; ("database engine") and
- d. A first gateway ("CGI program") within a server responsibly coupled to said publically available digital data communication network and said enterprise server which converts said service request from said first format to said second format without the use of a view buffer. (column 1, lines 25-27 and 57-67)

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 7, Leaf discloses an apparatus according to claim 6 further comprising:

a. A second gateway ("instance of transaction gateway client") within said server responsively coupled intermediate said publically available digital data communication network and said enterprise server which converts said service request from said first format to said second format with the use of a view buffer. (column 2, lines 48-60; column 7, lines 7-35)

Regarding claim 8, Leaf discloses an apparatus according to claim 7 wherein said publically accessible digital communication network further comprises the World Wide Web. (column 4, lines 1-16)

Regarding claim 9, Leaf discloses an apparatus according to claim 7, as assumed above, wherein said server further comprises WebTx middleware. (column 6, lines 27-48)

Regarding claim 10, Leaf discloses an apparatus according to claim 9, as assumed above, wherein said user terminal further comprises an industry compatible personal computer operating under Windows. (column 4, lines 18-24)

Regarding claim 11, Leaf discloses a method of processing a transaction comprising:

a. composing a service request in a first formats; b. transferring said service request via a publically accessible

Art Unit: 2143

digital data communication network ("Internet") to one of a gateway a server; and c. converting said service request into a second format for processing by a legacy data base management system without the use of a view buffer. (column 1, lines 25-27 and 57-67)

Regarding claim 12, Leaf discloses a method according to claim 11 further comprising: a. Transferring said converted service request from said gateway to said legacy data base management system. (column 1, lines 25-27 and 57-67, specifically lines 63-65)

Regarding claim 13, Leaf discloses a method according to claim 12 wherein said publically accessible digital data communication network further comprises the Internet. (column 4, lines 10-16)

Regarding claim 14, Leaf discloses a method according to claim 13 wherein said first format further comprises HTML. (column 1, lines 20-34, specifically lines 25-27)

Regarding claim 16, Leaf discloses an apparatus comprising:

- a. Means for generating a service request using a first format;
- b. Means responsively coupled to said generating means for transferring said service request via a publically accessible digital data network ("Internet");
- c. Means responsively coupled to said publically accessible digital data

network for converting said service request to a second format without using a view buffer; and d. Means responsively coupled to said converting means for processing said service request in said second format. (column 1, lines 25-27 and 57-67)

Regarding claim 17, Leaf discloses an apparatus according to claim 16 further comprising means responsively coupled to said processing means for transferring said service request said second format to an end service provider via one of a plurality of connectors. (column 1, lines 25-27 and 57-67, specifically lines 63-65)

Regarding claim 18, Leaf discloses an apparatus according to claim 17 wherein said first format further comprises HTML. (column 1, lines 20-34, specifically lines 25-27)

Regarding claim 19, Leaf discloses an apparatus according to claim 18 wherein said publically accessible digital data communication network is the Internet. (column 4, lines 10-16)

Regarding claim 20, Leaf discloses an apparatus according to claim 19 wherein said generating means further comprises an industry compatible personal computer operating under Windows. (column 4, lines 18-24)

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in

Art Unit: 2143

order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leaf in view of US Patent 6 725 426 B1 to Pavlov.

Regarding claim 15, Leaf discloses a method according to claim 13.

Leaf does not disclose wherein said first format further comprises XML, however, Leaf does disclose wherein said first format further comprises HTML as described above regarding claim 14.

Pavlov discloses that XML is an improvement to HTML based on its flexibility and improved set of capabilities (column 1, lines 30-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Leaf and Pavlov because one of ordinary skill would have recognized the advantages that XML has over HTML as taught within Pavlov and been motivated to combine the teachings of the references in order to utilize the more advantageous XML format.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent 6 205 482 B1 to Navarre et al;

US Patent 6 212 546 B1 to Starkovich et al;

US Patent 6 272 675 B1 to Schrab et al;

US Patent 6 321 251 B1 to Deisinger et al;

US Patent 6 324 681 B1 to Sebesta et al;

US Patent 6 397 220 B1 to Deisinger et al;

US Patent 6 643 679 B1 to Erickson et al;

US Patent 6 715 080 B1 to Starkovich et al.

NOTE: Effective 29 October 2004, the examiner will be moving to a new office location and may be reached at 571-272-3918.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George C. Neurauter, Jr. whose telephone number is 703-305-4565. The examiner can normally be reached on Thursday 1-2pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

gcn

William C. Vaughn
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2143
William C. Vaughn, Jr.